KAIST-TH 2005/12, KUNS-1982, KYUSHU-HET-85

arXiv:hep-ph/0508029v1 2 Aug 2005

Little SUSY hierarchy in mixed modulus-anomaly mediation

Kiwoon Choi*[1], Kwang Sik Jeong†[1], Tatsuo Kobayashi‡[2] and Ken-ichi Okumura§[3]

[1]*Department of Physics, Korea Advanced Institute*
of Science and Technology, Daejeon 305-701, Korea
[2]*Department of Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan*
[3]*Department of Physics, Kyushu University, Fukuoka 812-8581, Japan*

Abstract

Motivated by the KKLT string compactification involving a supersymmetry-breaking uplifting potential, we examine 4D effective supergravity with a generic form of uplifting potential, focusing on the possibility that the resulting mixed modulus-anomaly mediated soft terms realize the little hierarchy between the Higgs boson masses m_H and the sparticle masses m_{SUSY}. It is noted that for some type of uplifting potential, the anomaly-mediated contribution to m_H^2 at M_{GUT} can cancel the subsequent renormalization group evolution of m_H^2 down to TeV scale, thereby the model can naturally realize the little hierarchy $m_H^2 \sim m_{SUSY}^2/8\pi^2$ which is desirable for the lightest Higgs boson mass to satisfy the experimental bound. In such models, the other Higgs mass parameters μ and B can have the desirable size $\mu \sim B \sim m_H$ without severe fine-tuning of parameters, although the gravitino is much heavier than the Higgs boson. Those models for the little hierarchy avoid naturally the dangerous SUSY flavor and CP violations, and predict nearly degenerate low energy gaugino masses, pure Higgsino LSP, and also a specific relation between the stop and gaugino masses.

---

* kchoi@hep.kaist.ac.kr
† ksjeong@hep.kaist.ac.kr
‡ kobayash@gauge.scphys.kyoto-u.ac.jp
§ okumura@higgs.phys.kyushu-u.ac.jp

Low-energy supersymmetry (SUSY) is one of primary candidates for physics beyond the standard model (SM) above the weak scale [1]. One of the most important motivations for supersymmetric extension of the SM is to solve the hierarchy problem between the weak scale and GUT/Planck scale, The minimal supersymmetric extension of the standard model is important from the viewpoint of its minimality as well as the realization of gauge coupling unification at $M_{GUT} \sim 2 \times 10^{16}$ GeV. However, the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM) seems to face a fine-tuning problem, the so-called little SUSY hierarchy problem [2].

The little SUSY hierarchy problem is caused by the combination of the following aspects of the MSSM. First of all, the experimental bound of the CP-even Higgs boson mass m_{h^0} requires a rather large stop mass, $m_{\tilde{t}} \geq 500$ GeV, to enhance the radiative correction to $m^2_{h^0}$ due to the top-stop mass splitting [3]. On the other hand, the soft SUSY breaking scalar mass of the up-sector Higgs field m_{H_u} has a renormalization group (RG) evolution due to $m_{\tilde{t}}$:

$$\Delta m^2_{H_u} \sim -\frac{3}{4\pi^2} y_t^2 m^2_{\tilde{t}} \ln \frac{\Lambda}{m_{\tilde{t}}}, \tag{1}$$

where y_t is the top Yukawa coupling and Λ is the cut-off scale. This RG evolution effect indicates that $|m^2_{H_u}|$ at TeV scale is generically close to $m^2_{\tilde{t}}$ for $\Lambda \sim 10^{16}$ GeV. Finally the minimization condition of the Higgs potential in the MSSM leads to

$$\frac{M_Z^2}{2} \simeq -\mu^2 - m^2_{H_u}, \tag{2}$$

for a moderate and large value of $\tan\beta$. (This approximation is valid even for $\tan\beta \sim 3$ when $|m^2_{H_d}| \sim |m^2_{H_u}|$.) Then for $m^2_{H_u} \sim m^2_{\tilde{t}} \geq \mathcal{O}(500^2)$ GeV^2, one should fine-tune μ^2 in order to derive the weak scale, and the required degree of fine-tuning is $\mathcal{O}(1\%)$ or more severe. That is the little hierarchy problem.

Recently, several types of scenarios extending the MSSM [4]– [13] have been proposed to solve the little hierarchy problem. From a simple bottom-up viewpoint, a favored pattern of mass parameters would be

$$m^2_{\tilde{t}} \gg |m^2_H| \sim \mu^2 \sim |\mu B| = \mathcal{O}(100^2)\ \mathrm{GeV}^2, \tag{3}$$

at low energy scale. Then the key-point to solve the little hierarchy problem is to achieve (3) with canceling the large radiative correction (1). One scenario based on superconformal dynamics has been proposed [7], in which the superconformal dynamics cancels the large logarithmically divergent corrections, while leaving only small finite corrections. Here we propose another scenario based on the particular feature of the mixed modulus-anomaly mediated SUSY breaking scenario which might be realized in KKLT-type string compactification with SUSY-breaking anti-brane [14, 15].

Superstring theory is a promising candidate for unified theory including gravity. However, compactified string theory in general includes moduli fields which have a flat potential perturbatively. How to stabilize those moduli has been one of the most outstanding issues in string phenomenology. Recently, KKLT has proposed a new scenario to stabilize moduli and break SUSY in type IIB string compactification [14]. All complex structure moduli and the IIB dilaton are stabilized by the effects of 3-form fluxes. On top of that, the remaining Kähler moduli are stabilized through non-perturbative dynamics at SUSY AdS vacuum, and finally the vacuum is lifted to a dS (or Minkowski) vacuum by uplifting potential induced by anti-$D3$ brane. Soft SUSY breaking terms in such scenario has been studied in Ref. [15], and it has been shown that a quite new pattern of soft terms arises. In KKLT scenario, Kähler moduli F-terms are of the order of $m_{3/2}/4\pi^2$, thereby the moduli F-terms [16] and anomaly mediation [17] contribute comparably to the resultant soft masses $m_{SUSY} \sim m_{3/2}/4\pi^2$. Under a reasonable condition, anomaly mediated contributions at M_{GUT} cancel the subsequent RG evolution of soft parameters between M_{GUT} and a *mirage messenger scale* $\Lambda_m \sim (m_{3/2}/M_{Pl})^{\alpha/2} M_{GUT}$ where α is a parameter of order unity which is determined by the moduli-dependence of uplifting potential [18].(See also Refs. [19, 20] for other phenomenological aspects.) In the original KKLT model [14], the uplifting potential from anti-$D3$ brane gives $\alpha = 1$ [15]. However different forms of uplifting potential might be possible in other type of string compactifications, yielding different value of α. As we will discuss in this paper, the cancellation of RG evolution in the mixed modulus-anomaly mediation can have an interesting implication for the little hierarchy problem, particularly for certain form of uplifting potential yielding $\alpha = 2$.

In this paper, we examine the possibility of realizing the little hierarchy $m_H^2 \sim m_{SUSY}^2/8\pi^2$ in the framework of 4D effective supergravity (SUGRA) with a general form of uplifting potential. We discuss also the Higgs mass parameters μ and B in such effective SUGRA. Generically for the MSSM embedded in KKLT-motivated SUGRA, the resulting B is of the order of $m_{3/2} \sim 4\pi^2 m_{SUSY}$, thus too large to allow the correct electroweak symmetry breaking. However the models with $\alpha = 2$ allow B to be comparable to m_H without severe fine-tuning of parameters, as well as being able to lead to the natural cancellation of RG mixing between m_H^2 and m_{SUSY}^2. Moreover, those models for the little hierarchy avoid naturally the dangerous SUSY flavor and CP violations, and provide highly distinctive low energy predictions.

Although it appears to break SUSY explicitly, uplifting potential induced by anti-brane can be accommodated in 4D SUGRA in a consistent manner through a spurion operator (or more generally through a non-linear Goldstino superfield) in $N = 1$ superspace [15]. The effective action of such 4D SUGRA can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\text{eff}} \;=\; & \int d^4x\sqrt{g^C}\,\Big[\int d^4\theta\, CC^*\Big(-3\exp(-K/3)\Big) - C^2C^{2*}\theta^2\bar{\theta}^2\mathcal{P}_{\text{lift}} \\ & + \left\{\int d^2\theta\left(\frac{1}{4}f_a W^{a\alpha}W^a_\alpha + C^3W\right) + \text{h.c.}\right\}\Big], \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where K, W, and f_a denote the Kähler potential, superpotential and gauge kinetic functions of the standard $N = 1$ 4D SUGRA, while $\mathcal{P}_{\text{lift}}$ stands for the spurion operator providing the uplifting potential. Here we are using the superconformal formulation of 4D SUGRA with chiral compensator superfield C, and $g^C_{\mu\nu}$ is the 4D metric in superconformal frame which is related to the Einstein frame metric $g^E_{\mu\nu}$ as $g^C_{\mu\nu} = (CC^*)^{-1}e^{K/3}g^E_{\mu\nu}$. Note that one needs an off-shell formulation of $N = 1$ SUGRA in order to describe the coupling between the standard $N = 1$ SUGRA sector and the SUSY-breaking anti-brane which is presumed to generate the uplifting potential (or more generally a sector in which $N = 1$ SUSY is non-linearly realized). For simplicity, we choose the superconformal gauge in which both the fermionic component of C and the scalar auxiliary component of SUGRA multiplet are vanishing, and then ignore the dependence of SUGRA multiplets other than the metric dependence. There still remains a residual super Weyl invariance under

$$C \to e^{-2\tau}C, \quad g^C_{\mu\nu} \to e^{2(\tau+\tau^*)}g^C_{\mu\nu}, \quad \theta^\alpha \to e^{-\tau+2\tau^*}\theta^\alpha, \tag{5}$$

where τ is a complex constant, and the spurion operator should be invariant under this super Weyl transformation to keep the consistency of superconformal formulation.

Let T denote a modulus superfield whose VEV determines the unified gauge coupling at M_{GUT}, i.e.

$$f_a = T, \tag{6}$$

for the gauge kinetic functions of the SM gauge fields, and assume that T is the only light modulus which participates significantly in SUSY-breaking. We further assume that the theory possesses an approximate nonlinear PQ symmetry

$$U(1)_T: \quad T \to T + i\beta_T \quad (\beta_T = \text{real constant}), \tag{7}$$

which is broken by nonperturbative dynamics stabilizing T. Then the Kähler potential, superpotential and the spurion operator can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} K &= K_0(T+T^*) + Z_i(T+T^*)\Phi_i^*\Phi_i, \\ W &= W_0(T) + \frac{1}{6}\lambda_{ijk}\Phi_i\Phi_j\Phi_k, \\ \mathcal{P}_{\rm lift} &= \mathcal{P}_{\rm lift}(T+T^*), \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where λ_{ijk} are T-independent constants and the T-dependence of W_0 arises from non-perturbative dynamics. In the original KKLT model realized in type IIB string theory, T corresponds to a Kähler modulus which represents the volume of a 4-cycle wrapped by $D7$ branes containing the SM gauge fields. Throughout this paper, we will focus on the KKLT-form of the modulus superpotential:

$$W_0 = w_0 - Ae^{-aT}, \tag{9}$$

where w_0 is a (flux-induced) constant and Ae^{-aT} is generated by non-perturbative dynamics such as stringy instanton and/or field theoretic gaugino condensation. We assume that $w_0 = \mathcal{O}(m_{3/2}M_{st}^2)$ is small enough to give low energy SUSY, while $A = \mathcal{O}(M_{st}^3)$ or $\mathcal{O}(M_{GUT}^3)$ for the string or GUT scale which is rather close to M_{Pl}. Note that using the $U(1)_R$ transformation: $C \to e^{i\beta_R}C, \quad W \to e^{-3i\beta_R}W$ together with the non-linear PQ transformation (7), one can always make w_0 and A to be real parameters.

It is obvious that the spurion operator in (4) does not affect the standard on-shell relations for the SUSY breaking auxiliary components (in the Einstein frame):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{F^C}{C_0} &= \frac{1}{3}\partial_T K_0 F^T + m_{3/2}^*, \\ F^T &= -e^{K_0/2}\left(\partial_T\partial_{T^*}K_0\right)^{-1}\left(D_TW_0\right)^*, \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where $C = C_0 + \theta^2 F^C$, $m_{3/2} = e^{K_0/2}W_0$ and $D_TW_0 = \partial_TW_0 + W_0\partial_TK_0$. On the other hand, the modulus potential is modified to include the uplifting term:

$$\begin{aligned} V_0 &= V_F + V_{\rm lift} \\ &= e^{K_0}\left(\left(\partial_T\partial_{T^*}K_0\right)^{-1} D_TW_0(D_TW_0)^* - 3|W_0|^2\right) + e^{2K_0/3}\mathcal{P}_{\rm lift}(T,T^*), \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where V_F is the standard F-term potential in $N=1$ SUGRA. It is then straightforward to compute F^T and F^C by minimizing the above modulus potential under the fine tuning for $\langle V_0 \rangle = 0$. We then find the following relations between the VEVs:

$$
\begin{aligned}
aT &= \Big[1+\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)\Big] \ln(M_{Pl}/m_{3/2}), \\
\frac{m_{3/2}}{M_0} &= \frac{(T+T^*)\partial_T K_0}{3\partial_T \ln(V_{\rm lift})} \left[a - \left(\partial_T K_0 + \frac{\partial_T^2 K_0}{\partial_T K_0} - \frac{3\partial_T^2 K_0 \partial_T \ln(V_{\rm lift})}{(\partial_T K_0)^2} \right) \right] \Big[1+\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2)\Big] \\
&= \frac{2}{3} \frac{\partial_T K_0}{\partial_T \ln(V_{\rm lift})} \Big[1+\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)\Big] \ln(M_{Pl}/m_{3/2}),
\end{aligned}
\tag{12}
$$

where $\epsilon = 1/\ln(A/w_0) \sim 1/\ln(M_{Pl}/m_{3/2})$ is used as a small expansion parameter and

$$
M_0 \equiv \frac{F^T}{(T+T^*)}. \tag{13}
$$

Note that $\epsilon \sim 1/4\pi^2$ for $m_{3/2}$ in TeV range. Generically $\partial_T K_0/\partial_T \ln(V_{\rm lift})$ is of order unity, and thus the above result indicates $m_{3/2}/M_0 = \mathcal{O}(\ln(M_{Pl}/m_{3/2})) = \mathcal{O}(1/4\pi^2)$ *independently* of the detailed forms of K_0 and $V_{\rm lift}$. As a result, if the modulus which determines the unified gauge coupling is stabilized by the KKLT-type superpotential (9) and the vacuum is lifted to a dS (Minkowski) state by a SUSY-breaking spurion operator, it is a *generic* consequence of the model that the anomaly-mediated soft masses $\sim m_{3/2}/4\pi^2$ [17] are comparable to the modulus-mediated soft masses $\sim M_0$.

The soft terms in the above type of effective SUGRA have been studied in [15]. For the soft terms of canonically normalized visible fields:

$$
\mathcal{L}_{soft} = -\frac{1}{2} M_a \lambda^a \lambda^a - m_i^2 |\phi_i|^2 - \frac{1}{6} A_{ijk} y_{ijk} \phi_i \phi_j \phi_k + \text{h.c.}, \tag{14}
$$

where λ^a are gauginos, ϕ_i are sfermions, and $y_{ijk} = \lambda_{ijk}/\sqrt{e^{-K_0} Z_i Z_j Z_k}$ denote the canonically normalized Yukawa couplings, one finds the following mixed modulus-anomaly mediated soft parameters at energy scale just below the unification scale [15]:

$$
\begin{aligned}
M_a &= M_0 + \frac{b_a}{8\pi^2} g_{GUT}^2 m_{3/2}, \\
A_{ijk} &= \tilde{A}_{ijk} - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} (\gamma_i + \gamma_j + \gamma_k) m_{3/2}, \\
m_i^2 &= \tilde{m}_i^2 - \frac{1}{32\pi^2} \frac{d\gamma_i}{d\ln\mu} m_{3/2}^2 \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \left\{ \sum_{jk} \tilde{A}_{ijk} \left| \frac{y_{ijk}}{2} \right|^2 - C_2(\Phi_i) M_0 \right\} m_{3/2},
\end{aligned}
\tag{15}
$$

where $\tilde{A}_{ijk}$ and $\tilde{m}_i^2$ are the pure modulus-mediated trilinear A-parameters and soft scalar masses at M_{GUT}:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{A}_{ijk} &= (a_i + a_j + a_k)M_0, \\ \tilde{m}_i^2 &= \frac{2}{3}(V_F + V_{\rm lift}) + c_i|M_0|^2,\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

for

$$\begin{aligned}a_i &= (T+T^*)\partial_T \ln(e^{-K_0/3}Z_i), \\ c_i &= -(T+T^*)^2\partial_T\partial_{T^*}\ln(e^{-K_0/3}Z_i),\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

and $C_2(\Phi_i)\mathbf{1} = \sum_a g_a^2 T_a^2(\Phi_i)$ for the gauge generator $T_a(\Phi_i)$. Here b_a and γ_i are the one-loop beta function coefficients and the anomalous dimension of Q_i, respectively, defined by $\frac{dg_a}{d\ln\mu} = \frac{b_a}{8\pi^2}g_a^3$ and $\frac{d\ln Z_i}{d\ln\mu} = \frac{1}{8\pi^2}\gamma_i$.

Note that in the presence of the uplifting potential, the modulus-mediated soft scalar mass is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{m}_i^2 &= \frac{2}{3}\left(V_F + V_{\rm lift}\right) + c_i|M_0|^2 \\ &= \left[V_F + m_{3/2}^2 - F^T F^{T*}\partial_T\partial_{T^*}\ln(Z_i)\right] + \frac{2}{3}V_{\rm lift},\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where the terms in the bracket of the second line correspond to the modulus-mediated soft scalar mass in the standard $N=1$ SUGRA without uplifting potential [16], and the last term is the contribution from uplifting spurion which can be determined only in the superspace (off-shell) description of the uplifting potential such as in (4). Inclusion of this additional contribution is crucial for the correct calculation of soft scalar masses. If not included, $\tilde{m}_i$ appears to be of the order of $m_{3/2} \sim 4\pi^2 M_0$, while the correct value of $\tilde{m}_i$ is of the order of M_0 under the condition of vanishing vacuum energy density: $\langle V_F + V_{\rm lift}\rangle = 0$. In general, any source of the vacuum energy density can affect soft scalar mass also, and its contribution should be taken into account for the correct evaluation of soft scalar mass [21].

In fact, at the leading approximation ignoring higher order (stringy) threshold corrections, it is expected that K_0, Z_i and $\mathcal{P}_{\rm lift}$ take a form:

$$\begin{aligned}K_0 &= -n_0\ln(T+T^*), \\ Z_i &= \frac{1}{(T+T^*)^{n_i}}, \\ \mathcal{P}_{\rm lift} &= D(T+T^*)^{n_P},\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where n_0, n_i and n_P are appropriate *rational* numbers, and D is a constant to be adjusted for $\langle V_F + V_{\rm lift}\rangle = 0$. For this form of K_0, Z_i and $\mathcal{P}_{\rm lift}$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &\equiv \frac{m_{3/2}}{M_0 \ln(M_{Pl}/m_{3/2})} = \frac{2n_0}{2n_0 - 3n_P}, \\ a_i &= c_i = \frac{n_0}{3} - n_i, \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

up to small corrections of $\mathcal{O}(1/8\pi^2)$. In the original KKLT model, $n_0 = 3$ and the uplifting spurion originates from anti-$D3$ brane for which $n_P = 0$, and thus $\alpha = 1$. As for n_i, if Φ_i originates from $D7$-branes, we have $n_i = 0$ [22]. On the other hand, $n_i = 1/2$ for the matter fields living on the intersections of $D7$ branes, and $n_i = 1$ for the matter fields living on either the triple intersection of $D7$ branes or $D3$ branes [22]. Our approach here is not to consider a specific string compactification, but to consider generic effective SUGRA models described by arbitrary rational numbers n_0, n_P and n_i which are being of order unity.

Mixed modulus-anomaly mediation can give a low energy sparticle spectrum which is quite different from other scenarios of SUSY breaking. Taking into account 1-loop RG evolution, the low energy gaugino masses are given by

$$M_a(\mu) = M_0 \left[1 - \frac{1}{4\pi^2} b_a g_a^2(\mu) \ln\left(\frac{M_{GUT}}{(M_{Pl}/m_{3/2})^{\alpha/2}\mu}\right)\right], \tag{21}$$

where $g_a(\mu)$ are the running gauge couplings at scale μ. The low energy values of A_{ijk} and m_i^2 generically depend on the associated Yukawa couplings y_{ijk}. However if $y_{ijk} \lesssim 1/\sqrt{8\pi^2}$, *or* the following conditions are satisfied for the i-j-k combination with $y_{ijk} \gtrsim 1/\sqrt{8\pi^2}$:

$$\frac{\tilde{A}_{ijk}}{M_0} = \frac{\tilde{m}_i^2 + \tilde{m}_j^2 + \tilde{m}_k^2}{M_0^2} = 1, \tag{22}$$

their low energy values are given by

$$\begin{aligned} A_{ijk}(\mu) &= \tilde{A}_{ijk} + \frac{M_0}{8\pi^2}(\gamma_i(\mu) + \gamma_j(\mu) + \gamma_k(\mu)) \ln\left(\frac{M_{GUT}}{(M_{Pl}/m_{3/2})^{\alpha/2}\mu}\right), \\ m_i^2(\mu) &= \tilde{m}_i^2 - \frac{1}{8\pi^2} Y_i \Big(\sum_j \tilde{m}_j^2 Y_j\Big) g_Y^2(\mu) \ln\left(\frac{M_{GUT}}{\mu}\right) \\ &+ \frac{M_0^2}{4\pi^2}\left\{\gamma_i(\mu) - \frac{1}{2}\frac{d\gamma_i(\mu)}{d\ln\mu} \ln\left(\frac{M_{GUT}}{(M_{Pl}/m_{3/2})^{\alpha/2}\mu}\right)\right\} \ln\left(\frac{M_{GUT}}{(M_{Pl}/m_{3/2})^{\alpha/2}\mu}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where $\gamma_i(\mu)$ denote the running anomalous dimensions at μ and Y_i is the $U(1)_Y$ hypercharge of Φ_i.

The results of (21) and (23) show an interesting feature: when $\sum_i \tilde{m}_i^2 Y_i = 0$ and the condition (22) is satisfied, the low energy soft masses in the mixed modulus-anomaly mediation with messenger scale M_{GUT} are same as the low energy soft masses in the pure modulus-mediation started from the *mirage messenger scale* $\Lambda_m \approx (m_{3/2}/M_{Pl})^{\alpha/2} M_{GUT}$. This feature can have an interesting implication for the little hierarchy between the Higgs masses and the other superparticle masses in the MSSM. To see this, let us consider a class of models with n_0, n_i and n_P satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} n_P &= \frac{n_0}{3}, \quad n_{H_u} = n_{H_d} = \frac{n_0}{3}, \\ \sum_i n_i Y_i &= 0, \quad n_0 - n_{H_u} - n_{Q_3} - n_{U_3} = 1, \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

for which

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha = 2, \quad \tilde{m}^2_{H_u} = \tilde{m}^2_{H_d} = 0, \quad \sum_i \tilde{m}_i^2 Y_i = 0, \\ &\frac{\tilde{A}_t}{M_0} = \frac{\tilde{m}^2_{H_u} + \tilde{m}^2_{Q_3} + \tilde{m}^2_{U_3}}{M_0^2} = 1, \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where $A_t = A_{H_u Q_3 U_3}$ for Q_3 and U_3 denoting the top-doublet and the top-singlet. Note that under the assumption that n_0, n_i and n_P are rational numbers, the conditions of (24) are not a parameter fine-tuning, but correspond to a restriction to the specific class of models. For these models, the low energy expressions (21) and (23) are applicable. (As we will see, such models have a low $\tan\beta \lesssim 5$, for which the b and τ Yukawa couplings $y_{b,\tau} \lesssim 1/\sqrt{8\pi^2}$.) Then one easily finds that the model predicts

$$\begin{aligned} M_a(\Lambda_m) &= M_0\Big[1 + \mathcal{O}(1/8\pi^2)\Big], \quad A_t(\Lambda_m) = M_0\Big[1 + \mathcal{O}(1/8\pi^2)\Big], \\ m^2_{\tilde{t}_L}(\Lambda_m) + m^2_{\tilde{t}_R}(\Lambda_m) &= M_0^2\Big[1 + \mathcal{O}(1/8\pi^2)\Big], \quad m^2_{H_{u,d}}(\Lambda_m) = \mathcal{O}(M_0^2/8\pi^2), \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where $\Lambda_m \sim M_{GUT} m_{3/2}/M_{Pl} \sim 1$ TeV, thus realizes the Higgs-stop little hierarchy $m_H^2/m_{\tilde{t}}^2 = \mathcal{O}(1/8\pi^2)$ in a natural manner.

Unfortunately, the precise low energy values of $m^2_{H_{u,d}}$ are sensitive to the unknown threshold corrections of $\mathcal{O}(M_0^2/8\pi^2)$ at M_{GUT} (or at M_{st}) as well as the higher loop RG effects below M_{GUT} and the SUSY threshold corrections at TeV scale. It is still conceivable that $m^2_{H_u}$ is negative at the weak scale. For instance, $m^2_{H_u}$ at the weak scale might be dominated by the radiative corrections below Λ_m, $\Delta m^2_{H_u} \sim -\frac{3y_t^2}{4\pi^2} m_{\tilde{t}}^2 \ln(\Lambda_m/m_{\tilde{t}})$, if Λ_m is somewhat bigger than $m_{\tilde{t}}$. Then $m^2_{H_u}/m^2_{\tilde{t}}$ at the weak scale would be negative and bigger than $1/8\pi^2$ by a factor of few. Although not essential, one might choose also $n_{Q_3} = n_{U_3}$ for which $m^2_{\tilde{t}_L}(\Lambda_m) \simeq m^2_{\tilde{t}_R}(\Lambda_m) \simeq M_0^2/2$ and thus the radiative correction to m_{h^0} becomes maximal.

In the above model, the little hierarchy $m_H^2/m_{\tilde{t}}^2 = \mathcal{O}(1/8\pi^2)$ could be obtained since the RG evolution of m_H^2 between M_{GUT} and $\Lambda_m \sim 1$ TeV is canceled by the anomaly-mediated contribution at M_{GUT}. All conditions in (25) are necessary for the little hierarchy $m_{H_{u,d}}^2 = \mathcal{O}(m_{\tilde{t}}^2/8\pi^2)$ to be achieved through such cancellation. We stress that the cancellation of RG evolution and the associated low energy predictions (26) are the inevitable consequences of any SUSY breaking scenario yielding the soft terms of the form (15) satisfying (25), which could be naturally realized in KKLT-motivated effective SUGRA. Note that while the gaugino masses appear to be unified at TeV, the corresponding gauge couplings are still unified at $M_{GUT} \sim 2 \times 10^{16}$ GeV.

In order for the model to be viable, one needs also that the other two Higgs mass parameters μ and B satisfy the conditions for electroweak symmetry breaking:

$$\begin{aligned} |B\mu|^2 &> (m_{H_u}^2 + |\mu|^2)(m_{H_d}^2 + |\mu|^2), \\ 2|B\mu| &< m_{H_u}^2 + m_{H_d}^2 + 2|\mu|^2, \end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

for the Higgs potential

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\rm higgs} &= (m_{H_u}^2 + |\mu|^2)|H_u^0|^2 + (m_{H_d}^2 + |\mu|^2)|H_d^0|^2 \\ &\quad - (B\mu H_u^0 H_d^0 + \text{c.c.}) + \frac{1}{8}(g_1^2 + g_2^2)(|H_u^0|^2 - |H_d^0|^2)^2. \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

The parameter $|\mu^2|$ must be of $\mathcal{O}(m_{H_u}^2) = \mathcal{O}(M_Z^2)$ to avoid the fine-tuning in Eq. (2). Then the above electroweak symmetry breaking conditions would require

$$\mu \sim B \sim m_{H_{u,d}} \sim M_0/\sqrt{8\pi^2}, \tag{29}$$

which appears to be difficult to be realized in the mixed modulus-anomaly mediation. In fact, B in the mixed modulus-anomaly mediation is generically of the order of $m_{3/2} \sim 4\pi^2 M_0$, which is obviously too large to allow the electroweak symmetry breaking. However for the models with $n_P = n_0/3$ yielding $\alpha = 2$, one can achieve the desired size of μ and B without severe fine-tuning.

To see this, let us assume that the Higgsino mass parameter μ is generated by the same non-perturbative dynamics stabilizing T, thus the superpotential contains [23]

$$\Delta W = \tilde{A} e^{-aT} H_u H_d. \tag{30}$$

The resulting μ and B for the canonically normalized Higgs doublets renormalized at scales just below M_{GUT} are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &= \frac{e^{K_0/2}\tilde{A}e^{-aT}}{\sqrt{Z_{H_u}Z_{H_d}}}, \\ B &= M_0\left[a(T+T^*)+(T+T^*)\partial_T\ln(e^{-2K_0/3}Z_{H_u}Z_{H_d})\right] \\ &\quad -\frac{F^C}{C_0}+\frac{1}{16\pi^2}(\gamma_{H_u}+\gamma_{H_d})\frac{F^C}{C_0}, \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

where $\gamma_{H_{u,d}}$ denote the anomalous dimension of the Higgs doublets. One can simply choose the free parameter $\tilde{A}$ to take a value yielding $\mu(\Lambda_m)\sim m_H$, which does not interfere with the other parts of the model and is technically natural. On the other hand, B contains F^C/C_0 and $a(T+T^*)M_0$ which are of the order of $m_{3/2}\approx 4\pi^2 M_0$, thus too large in general. (Note that $aT\sim 4\pi^2$ in Eq. (12).) However for the models with $n_P=n_0/3$, these two contributions of $\mathcal{O}(m_{3/2})$ cancel to each other, leaving only a piece of $\mathcal{O}(M_0)$. In fact, the precise value of B is sensitive to the unknown higher order stringy or loop-threshold corrections to K_0 and $\mathcal{P}_{\rm lift}$ which can be parameterized as

$$\begin{aligned} K_0 &= -n_0\ln(T+T^*)+\Delta K_0, \\ \ln(\mathcal{P}_{\rm lift}/D) &= n_P\ln(T+T^*)+\Delta\Omega. \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Including the effects of ΔK_0 and $\Delta\Omega$, we find that the low energy value of B in the models of (24) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} B(\Lambda_m) &= a(T+T^*)M_0-\frac{F^C}{C_0}+\mathcal{O}(M_0/8\pi^2) \\ &= M_0\left[a(T+T^*)\left(1-\frac{\partial_T K_0}{3\partial_T\ln(V_{\rm lift})}\right)-\frac{2n_0}{3}+\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{8\pi^2}\right)\right] \\ &= -M_0\left[\frac{a(T+T^*)}{n_0}(T+T^*)\partial_T\Big(3\Delta\Omega-\Delta K_0\Big)+\frac{2n_0}{3}+\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{M_0}{8\pi^2}\right)\right], \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

for $n_P=n_0/3$ yielding $\alpha=2$. Note that the last term of $B(M_{GUT})$ in (31) cancels the RG evolution of B down to $\Lambda_m\sim M_{GUT}m_{3/2}/M_{Pl}\sim 1$ TeV, thereby $B(\Lambda_m)$ is simply determined by $a(T+T^*)M_0$ and F^C/C_0 as in (33). Since $a(T+T^*)\sim 8\pi^2$, the part depending on ΔK_0 and $\Delta\Omega$ can be important even when ΔK_0 and/or $\Delta\Omega$ are the corrections of $\mathcal{O}(1/8\pi^2)$. With a minor tuning of such higher order effects, e.g. a tuning of $10\sim 20$ %, one can obtain $B(\Lambda_m)$ which is small enough, e.g. $0.2M_0$, to satisfy the electroweak symmetry breaking condition (27) for $\mu\sim m_H\sim M_0/\sqrt{8\pi^2}$.

As summarized in (26), the models of (24) give strong predictions on the sparticle masses. The model predicts approximately universal low energy gaugino masses, $M_a(\text{TeV}) \simeq M_0 = \mathcal{O}(1)$ TeV, which is the consequence of $n_P = n_0/3$ yielding $\alpha = 2$, and also the stop masses satisfying $m^2_{\tilde{t}_L}(\text{TeV}) + m^2_{\tilde{t}_R}(\text{TeV}) \simeq M_0^2$. In view of Eq. (33), it is difficult that B is significantly smaller than $\mu \sim m_{H_{u,d}}$, thus the resulting $\tan\beta$ is expected to be less than moderate, e.g. $\tan\beta \lesssim 5$, justifying our assumption $y_{b,\tau} \lesssim 1/\sqrt{8\pi^2}$. Obviously then the LSP of the model is almost Higgsino-like neutralino, and the next LSP is the almost Higgsino-like chargino.

It is quite remarkable that the model discussed above naturally avoids the SUSY flavor and CP problems as well as giving the little hierarchy $m_H^2 \sim m^2_{SUSY}/8\pi^2$. First of all, the model is free from dangerous SUSY flavor violation if n_i are chosen to be flavor-independent, which is a rather plausible possibility in view of their stringy origin. As for SUSY CP, it has been noticed [15] that the non-linear PQ symmetry (7) of the model guarantees that one can always choose a field basis in which M_0 and $m_{3/2}$ are real, and thus M_a and A_{ijk} are real also. The result of (33) shows that the invariance of ΔK and $\Delta\Omega$ under $U(1)_T$ assures that B is real also in the same field basis, thus the model is completely free from dangerous SUSY CP violation.

There is another interesting aspect of the model related to the color and/or charge breaking (CCB) and the unbounded-from-below (UFB) direction in the full scalar potential. Detailed studies on CCB and UFB directions of the MSSM potential have been carried out in Ref. [24]. The most serious constraint is obtained by the so-called UFB-3 direction, which includes the up-sector Higgs and slepton fields $\{H_u, \tilde{\nu}_{L_i}, \tilde{e}_{L_j}, \tilde{e}_{R_j}\}$. The potential along the UFB-3 direction becomes unbounded-from-below if $m^2_{H_u} + m^2_{\tilde{L}_i} < 0$ at low energy scale. In many models, $m^2_{H_u} + m^2_{\tilde{L}_i}$ at low-energy scale becomes negative because $\Delta m^2_{H_u} \sim -m^2_{\tilde{t}}$ and $m^2_{\tilde{t}} \gg m^2_{\tilde{L}_i}$ due to the RG evolution effects from gluino mass. However, for the class of models discussed above, one can easily arrange n_i to get $m^2_{\tilde{L}_i}(\Lambda_m) \sim M_0^2$ and thus $m^2_{H_u} + m^2_{\tilde{L}_i} > 0$ at low energy scale.

So far, we have been discussing the models leading to $m^2_{H_u}(\Lambda_m) \sim m^2_{H_d}(\Lambda_m) \sim m^2_{SUSY}/8\pi^2$. One might consider an alternative scenario leading to the different pattern of little hierarchy:

$$m^2_{H_d}(\Lambda_m) \sim 8\pi^2 m^2_{H_u}(\Lambda_m) \sim m^2_{SUSY}. \tag{34}$$

In order to get such pattern of low energy spectrum, one still needs the last condition of (24) as well as $n_P = n_{H_u} = n_0/3$. Concerned about n_{H_d}, we need more conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} n_0 - 1 &= n_{H_d} + n_{Q_3} + n_{D_3} = n_{H_d} + n_{L_3} + n_{E_3}, \\ n_{H_d} &< \frac{n_0}{3}, \qquad \frac{1}{2}\left(n_{H_d} - \frac{1}{3}n_0\right) = \sum_{\text{matter}} n_i Y_i, \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

where the first condition is to satisfy (22) for the b and τ Yukawa couplings which are not negligible anymore since $\tan\beta \sim \sqrt{8\pi^2}$ (see the discussion below), the second condition is required for $m^2_{H_d}(\Lambda_m) = \mathcal{O}(M_0^2)$, and the last condition is introduced to protect small $m^2_{H_u}$ from the RG running effect proportional to $\sum_i \tilde{m}_i^2 Y_i$. In such models, $B = \mathcal{O}(M_0)$ would satisfy the symmetry breaking condition (27), and the expected ratios of the Higgs mass parameters at the weak scale are given by

$$m^2_{H_d} : |m^2_{H_u}| : |\mu B| : \mu^2 = \mathcal{O}(M_0^2) : \mathcal{O}(M_0^2/8\pi^2) : \mathcal{O}(M_0^2/\sqrt{8\pi^2}) : \mathcal{O}(M_0^2/8\pi^2). \tag{36}$$

The resulting $\tan\beta$ is determined by

$$\frac{\tan\beta}{1+\tan^2\beta} = \frac{\mu B}{m^2_{H_d} + m^2_{H_u} + 2\mu^2} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{8\pi^2}}\right), \tag{37}$$

yielding a moderately large $\tan\beta = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{8\pi^2})$. The above models for the mass pattern (34) appear to be less attractive than the models of (24) yielding $m^2_{H_u} \sim m^2_{H_d} \sim M_0^2/8\pi^2$ as they require more conditions on n_i.

To summarize, we pointed out that the little hierarchy $m_H^2 \sim m^2_{SUSY}/8\pi^2$ which is desirable for the lightest MSSM higgs boson to satisfy the experimental bound can be naturally realized in 4D effective SUGRA models with certain class of uplifting potential. Such spectrum is realized by the cancellation between the anomaly mediated soft terms at M_{GUT} and the subsequent RG evolution down to the TeV scale. Under a reasonable condition, the model can give rise to μ and B satisfying the electroweak symmetry breaking condition without severe fine-tuning. Furthermore, the model naturally avoids dangerous SUSY flavor and CP violations, and also is favorable from the viewpoint of CCB and UFB constraints.

The model predicts a unique low-energy spectrum. The three MSSM gaugino masses M_a ($a = 1, 2, 3$) are almost universal at low energy scale, $M_a(\text{TeV}) \simeq M_0 = \mathcal{O}(1)$ TeV, and the stop masses satisfy the sum rule $m^2_{\tilde{t}_L}(\text{TeV}) + m^2_{\tilde{t}_R}(\text{TeV}) \simeq M_0^2$. The LSP is the Higgsino-like neutralino with a mass of $\mathcal{O}(100)$ GeV, the next LSP is the Higgsino-like chargino, and their masses are nearly degenerate. The gravitino mass $m_{3/2} \sim 4\pi^2 M_0 \sim \mathcal{O}(30)$ TeV and the modulus mass $m_T \sim 8\pi^2 m_{3/2} = \mathcal{O}(10^3)$ TeV, thus can avoid the cosmological gravitino/moduli problem [19]. It would be quite interesting to study more phenomenological aspects of our model as well as the cosmological aspects [25].

Acknowledgments

K.C. and K.S.J are supported by the KRF Grant funded by the Korean Government (KRF-2005-201-C00006), the KOSEF Grant (KOSEF R01-2005-000-10404-0), and the Center for High Energy Physics of Kyungpook National University. T.K. is supported in part by the Grand-in-Aid for Scientific Research #16028211 and #17540251, and the Grant-in-Aid for the 21st Century COE "The Center for Diversity and Universality in Physics" and K.O. is supported by the Grand-in-aid for Scientific Research on Priority Areas #441: "Progress in elementary particle physics of the 21st century through discovery of Higgs boson and supersymmetry" #16081209 from the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology of Japan.

[1] H. P. Nilles, Phys. Rept. **110**, 1 (1984); H. E. Haber and G. L. Kane, Phys. Rept. **117**, 75 (1985).

[2] R. Barbieri and G. F. Giudice, Nucl. Phys. B **306**, 63 (1988); P. H. Chankowski, J. R. Ellis and S. Pokorski, Phys. Lett. B **423**, 327 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ph/9712234]; P. H. Chankowski, J. R. Ellis, M. Olechowski and S. Pokorski, Nucl. Phys. B **544**, 39 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9808275]; G. L. Kane and S. F. King, Phys. Lett. B **451**, 113 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9810374]; M. Bastero-Gil, G. L. Kane and S. F. King, Phys. Lett. B **474**, 103 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/9910506].

[3] H. E. Haber and R. Hempfling, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 1815 (1991); Y. Okada, M. Yamaguchi and T. Yanagida, Prog. Theor. Phys. **85**, 1 (1991); Phys. Lett. B **262**, 54 (1991). J. R. Ellis, G. Ridolfi and F. Zwirner, Phys. Lett. B **257**, 83 (1991); Phys. Lett. B **262**, 477 (1991).

[4] A. Brignole, J. A. Casas, J. R. Espinosa and I. Navarro, Nucl. Phys. B **666**, 105 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0301121]; J. A. Casas, J. R. Espinosa and I. Hidalgo, JHEP **0401**, 008 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0310137].

[5] P. Batra, A. Delgado, D. E. Kaplan and T. M. P. Tait, JHEP **0402**, 043 (2004)

[arXiv:hep-ph/0309149].

[6] R. Harnik, G. D. Kribs, D. T. Larson and H. Murayama, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 015002 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0311349].

[7] T. Kobayashi and H. Terao, JHEP **0407**, 026 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0403298]; T. Kobayashi, H. Nakano and H. Terao, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 115009 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0502006].

[8] S. Chang, C. Kilic and R. Mahbubani, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 015003 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0405267].

[9] A. Birkedal, Z. Chacko and Y. Nomura, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 015006 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0408329].

[10] K. S. Babu, I. Gogoladze and C. Kolda, arXiv:hep-ph/0410085.

[11] A. Birkedal, Z. Chacko and M. K. Gaillard, JHEP **0410**, 036 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0404197].

[12] Z. Chacko, Y. Nomura and D. Tucker-Smith, arXiv:hep-ph/0504095.

[13] A. Delgado and T. M. P. Tait, arXiv:hep-ph/0504224.

[14] S. Kachru, R. Kallosh, A. Linde and S. P. Trivedi, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 046005 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0301240].

[15] K. Choi, A. Falkowski, H. P. Nilles, M. Olechowski and S. Pokorski, JHEP **0411**, 076 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0411066]; K. Choi, A. Falkowski, H. P. Nilles and M. Olechowski, Nucl. Phys. **B718**, 113 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0503216].

[16] V. S. Kaplunovsky and J. Louis, Phys. Lett. B **306**, 269 (1993) [arXiv:hep-th/9303040]; A. Brignole, L. E. Ibanez and C. Munoz, Nucl. Phys. B **422**, 125 (1994) [Erratum-ibid. B **436**, 747 (1995)] [arXiv:hep-ph/9308271].

[17] L. Randall and R. Sundrum, Nucl. Phys. B **557**, 79 (1999) [arXiv:hep-th/9810155]; G. F. Giudice, M. A. Luty, H. Murayama and R. Rattazzi, JHEP **9812**, 027 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ph/9810442]; J. A. Bagger, T. Moroi and E. Poppitz, JHEP **0004**, 009 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/9911029]; P. Binetruy, M. K. Gaillard and B. D. Nelson, Nucl. Phys. B **604**, 32 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0011081].

[18] K. Choi, K. S. Jeong and K. Okumura, arXiv:hep-ph/0504037.

[19] M. Endo, M. Yamaguchi and K. Yoshioka, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 015004 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0504036].

[20] A. Falkowski, O. Lebedev and Y. Mambrini, arXiv:hep-ph/0507110.

[21] K. Choi, J. E. Kim and H. P. Nilles, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 1758 (1994) [arXiv:hep-ph/9404311].

[22] L. E. Ibanez, C. Munoz and S. Rigolin, Nucl. Phys. **B553**, 43 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9812397].

[23] E. J. Chun, J. E. Kim and H. P. Nilles, Nucl. Phys. **B370**, 105 (1992).

[24] J. A. Casas, A. Lleyda and C. Munoz, Nucl. Phys. B **471**, 3 (1996).

[25] K. Choi, K. S. Jeong, T. Kobayashi and K. Okumura, in preparation.